UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/574,674	04/04/2006	David Hill	6106-000005/US/NP	3717

27572 7590 10/06/2009

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. BOX 828
BLOOMFIELD HILLS, MI 48303

EXAMINER	
BITAR, NANCY	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2624	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
10/06/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/574,674	HILL ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	NANCY BITAR	2624	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *08 June 2009*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-13* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-6,8-12* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) *7 and 13* is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *04 April 2006* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *9/29/2009*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicant's response to the last Office Action, filed 05/12/2009, has been entered and made of record.

2. Applicant has amended claims 1-3, 5, 7, 9, and 12-13. Claims 1-13 are currently pending.

3. Applicants arguments filed 06/08/2009 have been fully considered Applicant's arguments, in the amendment filed 6/8/2009, with respect to the rejections of claims 1-13 under 35 U.S.C102 (b) have been fully considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection necessitated by the amendments. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Monroe et al (US 7,131,136)

Examiner Notes

4. Examiner cites particular columns and line numbers in the references as applied to the claims below for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings in the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested that, in preparing responses, the applicant fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the examiner

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1--6, 8 and 9 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ramirez et al (US 6,476,858) in view of Monroe et al (US 7,131,136)

7. As to claim 1, Ramirez et al teaches and image monitoring system (system wherein a plurality of video cameras may be monitored from a local or remote location, column 4, lines 19-21) comprising:

A central controller; and a plurality of digital still camera units operatively connected to the central controller (figure 8A; column 4, lines 54-column 5, lines 5; see also figure 4 that shows 10-camera system), note that Ramirez clearly teaches that the invention is not limited in terms of video standard, and supports NTSC, PAL, SECAM, or any other cameras with higher resolutions. Therefore a the use of digital still camera units can be used (see column 3 lines 24-49)wherein at least one of the camera units comprises an image sensor (302, figure 8A);

a motion detector operatively connected to the image sensor that causes the image sensor to receive digital still image data when motion is detected (motion detection devices, column 4, lines 19-28 ; note that Input devices such as motion sensors and switches may be monitored across the optically isolated inputs 403 or over the TTL inputs 404.) ; a micro

controller operatively connected to the image sensor and to the motion detector (313, figure 8A); a first nonvolatile memory operatively connected to or included in the micro controller (the I2C control 311 is a serial controller that communicates with serial non-volatile memories such as 12C NV memory 305, column 5, lines 6-15); and computer readable program code stored on the first memory for causing the micro controller to determine whether the digital still image data should be transmitted to the central controller, wherein the central controller then determines whether the digital still image data should be transmitted to a monitoring station (figure 9A-9B). While Ramirez meets a number of the limitations of the claimed invention, as pointed out more fully above, Ramirez fails to specifically teach the micro controller to determine whether the digital still image data should be transmitted to a the central controller or a monitoring station"

Specifically, Monroe et al. teaches the use of digital still camera (c1,c2,c3,c4; figure 1) where digital surveillance information is collected, processed, dispatched, and log via remote control and access. The system includes a variety of system appliances such as surveillance cameras, sensors, detectors, and panic buttons and accommodates legacy equipment (see abstract).Monroe clearly teaches the processor analyzes the information and dispatches instructional data to the crew, as well as to appropriate response personnel, based upon events such as motion detection or a triggered sensor in a particular area in a particular time window when the system is "armed". Administrative and maintenance triggers may also be generated .The still image data the video data and other packet data are transmitted in IP format via the SATCOM link 22 to a communications satellite 24 and via the satellite 24 to a ground terminal 26, where it can be managed and distributed for surveillance, assessment, archiving and response purposes. The data can be readily distributed over a connected LAN or WAN network, as

indicated at 28 and/or over switched circuits such as the PSTN 30 (see figure 1 and 3). it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the controller to transmit the image data to the monitoring station in the microcontroller interface, 313 of Ramirez in order to have a high accuracy security system thus obtaining good real-time information of an event as it occurs, and for providing comprehensive information to a variety of response vehicles and personnel to better assist in the real-time response efforts .Therefore, the claimed invention would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention by applicant.

As to claim 2, Ramirez et al teaches the image monitoring system of claim 1, wherein the plurality of camera units transmit the digital still image data wirelessly to the central controller (figure 7; column 4, lines 50-53).

As to claims 3 -5, Monroe teaches a mesh networking protocol enabling image data to be routed indirectly and wirelessly through one or more of the camera units to the central controller (figure 1) and that at least one of the camera units further comprises a microphone (column 9 lines 45-column 10 lines 1-6) and the use of both a color and black and white image sensors to improve light sensitivity (column 9, lines 12-30).

As to claim 6, Ramirez et al teaches the image monitoring system of claim 1, wherein at least one of the camera units is battery operated and comprises direct memory access circuitry between an image sensor and a second nonvolatile memory (column 5, lines 5-14).

As to claim 8, Ramirez et al teaches the image monitoring system of claim 1, wherein the monitoring station forms a component of the image monitoring system, and wherein the monitoring station includes human personnel who further analyze the images to determine whether an alarm should be sent to an authority (see figure 9B).

The limitation of claim 9 has been addressed above (see claim 1) except for the following: Ramirez teaches triggering, following the detection of motion of the moving object, an image sensor included in at least one of the camera units to receive an image of the moving object (The digitized information from each video camera is alternatively analyzed using image processing techniques and to trigger alarm events. Other alternatives provide ON/OFF signals from devices such as infrared sensors, motion sensors, alarm signals or cameras with built-in motion detection. To sense ON/OFF signal states the software constantly monitors digital I/O logic until a signal activates, generating an alarm event. Once the alarm event occurs, the digitized camera image may then be saved in a database, or, alternatively, transmitted over a network or Internet to one or more remote locations, figure 8A); determining whether the received image should be transmitted wirelessly to the central controller by analyzing the image using a micro controller included in at least one of the camera units and operatively connected to the image sensor (column 4, lines 41-column 5, lines 65) and determining whether any images received at the central controller from at least one of the camera units should be transmitted to a monitoring station (column 5, lines 15-23; see also Monroe figures 1 and 2)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary

skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 10-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ramirez et al (US 6,476,858) in view of Monroe et al (US 7,131,136) and further in view of Rajeev et al (CA 2.242.322) .

While Ramirez and Monroe meets a number of the limitations of the claimed invention, as pointed out more fully above, Ramirez fails to specifically teach triggering a black and white image sensor in low light conditions, and otherwise triggering a color image sensor, wherein at least one camera unit includes both the color image sensor and the black and white image sensor operatively connected to a single high-speed DMA bus

Specifically, Rajeev et al. teaches the use uses a video camera to capture video images and output them in standard video format. A digital video decoder is coupled to the output of the video camera, to convert the video images into digital data, with a capture rate that corresponds with the standard format rate of digital video. This is combined with a motion detection system (6, 7), and fitted into a tamper-proof enclosure. Moreover, Rajeev teaches in figure 2 a video camera 1 captures video image in one of eight different types of video formats which includes regular and high resolution EIA, CCIR, NTSR, and PAL analog video standards. The use of microphone or the use of color or black and white image sensors helps in improving the low light sensitivity. Rajeev teaches the system includes a programmer interface such as serial port which is operative to input and output program and diagnostic information by using a remote arm/disarm that allow the user to activate/deactivate the device without having to contact it ((page 12, line 1, figure 1a; figure 2; pages 8, lines 21-page 9, line 1-23) . It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to implement the microphone, and the different kind of

image sensors in Rodriguez in view of Monroe in order to provide a cost effective embedded surveillance system with a user interface and on-screen display so that it is operable without any dependence on a PC or other external operational unit, effectively eliminating the need for external cabling and the other costs and problems associated with PC's (page 6,lines 11-16). Therefore, the claimed invention would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention by applicant.

Allowable Subject Matter

10. As previously indicated, Claims 7 and 13 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

11. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to NANCY BITAR whose telephone number is (571)270-1041. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri (7:30a.m. to 5:00pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vikkram Bali can be reached on 571-272-7415. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Nancy Bitar/
Examiner, Art Unit 2624

/VIKKRAM BALI/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2624